

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-3, 6, 8, 9, 14-22, 36-47, 50-52 and 64-75 were presented for examination and were rejected.

Claims 45-47, 50, and 52 are now canceled.

The applicant respectfully traverses the rejections and requests reconsideration in light of the following comments.

Pursuant to 37 CFR §1.133(b), the applicants submit this statement as a complete and proper recordation of the substance of the telephone interview with Examiner Sharad Rampuria on January 10, 2008.

In addition, the applicants state that the points made in the remarks of this amendment are the substantive points that were made during the interview. No other substantive information was discussed.

#### **35 U.S.C. 112 Rejection of Claims 1 and 14**

Claims 1 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In particular, claim 1 was rejected for reciting the term "datum", and claim 14 was rejected for reciting the terms "request" and "version". The Examiner indicated in the telephone interview that the reason for the rejection is that these terms are "very broad."

The applicant respectfully disagrees: it is entirely appropriate to recite these terms in the claims. Applicant also respectfully notes that these terms are used throughout the entire specification of the present application and are abundantly clear (in fact, the term "request to access content" is explicitly defined in paragraphs [0004] and [0005] of the background).

For these reasons, the applicants respectfully submit that the rejection is traversed.

#### **35 U.S.C. 102 Rejection of Claims 1-3, 6, 8, 9, 14-22, 36-47, 50-52 and 64-**

#### **75**

Claims 1-3, 6, 8, 9, 14-22, 36-47, 50-52 and 64-75 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by J. T. E. McDonnell, et al., U.S. Patent Application 2002/0177449 (hereinafter "McDonnell"). The applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 1 recites:

**1. A method comprising:**

receiving at a mobile telecommunications terminal a command that reads the value of a datum; and

determining whether to execute said command based on the geo-location of said mobile telecommunications terminal **and on said value.**

*(emphasis supplied)*

Nowhere does McDonnell teach or suggest, alone or in combination with the other references, what claim 1 recites – namely receiving at a mobile terminal a command to read the value of a datum (e.g., John Smith’s account balance, etc.), and determining whether to execute the command based on the terminal’s geo-location and on the datum’s value. The present invention as recited in claim 1 is advantageous in that it can be used, for example, to prevent a user from accessing John Smith’s account balance from his or her mobile terminal unless the terminal is located inside the bank and the account balance is less than one million dollars. Applicant respectfully notes that the Office never asserts in its rejection of claim 1 that McDonnell in fact teaches this important feature of the present invention.

For this reason, the applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of claim 1 is traversed.

Because claims 2, 3, 6, 8, and 9 depend on claim 1, the applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of them is also traversed.

Claim 14 recites:

**14. A method comprising:**

receiving at a mobile telecommunications terminal a request to access content; and

determining a version of said content to access based on the geo-location of said mobile telecommunications terminal.

*(emphasis supplied)*

Nowhere does McDonnell teach or suggest, alone or in combination with the other references, what claim 14 recites – namely receiving a request from a mobile terminal to access content, and determining what version of the content to transmit to the terminal based on the terminal’s geo-location. The present invention is advantageous in that it can be used, for example, to provide a user with an edited version of a video clip when the user is in a church, and an unedited version of the video clip when the user is at home.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Office’s assertion that McDonnell teaches the limitations of the second part of claim 14 in paragraphs 0060, 0068, and 0071.

Applicant respectfully submits that McDonnell doesn't teach anything about versions of content anywhere in the patent application.

For these reasons, the applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of claim 14 is traversed.

Because claims 15 through 22 depend on claim 14, the applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of them is also traversed.

Claim 36 recites:

**36.** A method comprising:  
transmitting from a mobile telecommunications terminal a request to access remote content; and  
receiving at said mobile telecommunications terminal a version of said remote content that is based on the geo-location of said mobile telecommunications terminal.  
*(emphasis supplied)*

For the same reasons as for claim 14, the applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of claim 36 is traversed.

Because claims 37 through 44 depend on claim 36, the applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of them is also traversed.

Independent claim 45 is now canceled.

Claim 64 recites:

**64.** A method comprising:  
receiving at a mobile telecommunications terminal a command that updates the value of a datum; and  
determining whether to execute said command based on the geo-location of said mobile telecommunications terminal and on said value prior to updating.  
*(emphasis supplied)*

For the same reasons as for claim 1, the applicant respectfully submits that claim 64 is allowable.

Because claims 65 through 70 depend on claim 64, the applicant respectfully submits that they are also allowable.

Claim 71 recites:

**71. A method comprising:**

receiving at a mobile telecommunications terminal a command that reads the value of a datum; and

determining whether to execute said command based on the geo-location of said mobile telecommunications terminal and on the geo-location at which said value is stored.

*(emphasis supplied)*

Nowhere does McDonnell teach or suggest, alone or in combination with the other references, what claim 71 recites – namely receiving at a mobile terminal a command to read the value of a datum, and determining whether to execute the command based on the terminal's geo-location and on the geo-location at which the datum's value is stored. The present invention is advantageous in that it can be used, for example, to allow an employee at the San Francisco branch of XYZ Corp. to access data stored at the XYZ consumer division branch in New York, but to prevent the user from accessing any data stored at the XYZ defense systems division in Virginia. Applicant respectfully notes that the Office never asserts in its rejection of claim 71 that McDonnell in fact teaches this important feature of the present invention.

For these reasons, the applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of claim 71 is traversed.

Because claims 72 through 75 depend on claim 71, the applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of them is also traversed.

**Request for Reconsideration Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.111**

Having responded to each and every ground for objection and rejection in the Office action mailed November 29, 2006, applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the instant application pursuant to 37 CFR 1.111 and request that the Examiner allow all of the pending claims and pass the application to issue.

If there are remaining issues, the applicant respectfully requests that Examiner telephone the applicants' attorney at 732-578-0103 x11 so that those issues can be resolved as quickly as possible.

Respectfully,  
Doree Duncan Seligmann

By **/Jason Paul DeMont/**  
Reg. No. 35793  
Attorney for Applicants  
732-578-0103 x11

DeMont & Breyer, L.L.C.  
Suite 250  
100 Commons Way  
Holmdel, NJ 07733  
United States of America